

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/619,337	BATLAW, RAJNISH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Callie E. Shosho	1714

All Participants:

(1) Callie E. Shosho.

(3) _____.

(2) Tom Moses.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 February 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

15, 18-20

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. *Part II above*.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. Moses. Page 5 of the amendment filed 12/16/03 stated that new claims 11-20 require that the black offset inks be oil-based. While independent claim 11 recited that the offset ink was oil-based, claims 15, 19, and 20 did not. The examiner's amendment was authorized by Mr. Moses so that claims 15, 19, and 20 would each recite the same claim language as claim 11 in order to distinguish the claims from the prior art. Further, the amendment to claim 18 was made in order to ensure proper antecedent basis.